

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-23 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 17 and 19 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

### 112 Rejections

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1 and 9 are amended herein to correct this deficiency.

### 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson et al. ("Hanson;" U.S. Patent No. 6,442,734) in view of Severt et al. ("Severt;" US 5,602,750). The Applicants have reviewed these references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-23 is not shown or suggested by Hanson and Severt, alone or in combination.

Each of the claims recites a cradle element couplable to a portable computer system. The cradle element has a pin, and the resistance value of the pin indicates a type of communication interface (e.g., Universal Serial Bus or RS232) that is used by the cradle element. Specifically, independent Claim 1 recites "reading a resistance value of a pin on a cradle element that receives said portable computer system and that couples said portable computer system to a second computer system" and "identifying a type of communication interface used with said cradle element according to said resistance value." Independent Claim 9 recites "a communication interface port coupled to said bus, said communication interface port operable to couple with a cradle element, said cradle element

comprising a pin, wherein a resistance value of said pin indicates a type of communication interface used by said cradle element to communicate with a second computer system also operable to couple with said cradle element." Independent Claim 17 recites "reading at said portable computer system a resistance value of a pin on said cradle element" and "identifying at said portable computer system a type of communication interface, wherein said type of communication interface is identified by said resistance value." Claims 2 and 4-8 are dependent on Claim 1; Claims 10 and 12-16 are dependent on Claim 9; and Claims 18-23 are dependent on Claim 17.

Applicants respectfully assert that Hanson does not show or suggest a cradle element couplable to a portable computer system, the cradle element having a pin, where the resistance value of the pin indicates a type of communication interface that is used by the cradle element. In fact, referring to Hanson, the instant Office Action includes the statement that "it is not explicitly disclosed in the mentioned prior art the step of reading a resistance value of a pin on a cradle element that receives the portable computer system and that couples the personal computer system to a second computer system" (page 3 of the Office Action). Applicants respectfully agree with this statement.

Applicants respectfully submit that Severt does not overcome this shortcoming in Hanson. Severt describes a cradle for holding a hand-held unit, where the cradle and the unit communicate via an infrared link. Applicants respectfully submit that Severt, alone or in combination with Hanson, does not show or suggest a pin on a cradle element. More importantly, Applicants respectfully submit that Severt, alone or in combination with Hanson, does not

show or suggest a cradle element couplable to a portable computer system, the cradle element having a pin, where the resistance value of the pin indicates a type of communication interface that is used by the cradle element.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Hanson and Severt, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest "reading a resistance value of a pin on a cradle element that receives said portable computer system and that couples said portable computer system to a second computer system" as recited in independent Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Hanson and Severt, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest "a communication interface port coupled to said bus, said communication interface port operable to couple with a cradle element, said cradle element comprising a pin, wherein a resistance value of said pin indicates a type of communication interface used by said cradle element to communicate with a second computer system also operable to couple with said cradle element" as recited in independent Claim 9. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Hanson and Severt, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest "reading at said portable computer system a resistance value of a pin on said cradle element" and "identifying at said portable computer system a type of communication interface, wherein said type of communication interface is identified by said resistance value" as recited in independent Claim 17.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that Hanson and Severt, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present claimed invention as recited by independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, and that Claims 1, 9 and 17 are therefore in condition for allowance. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Hanson

and Severt, alone or in combination, also do not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 2 and 4-8 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 10 and 12-16 dependent on Claim 9, and Claims 18-23 dependent on Claim 17 and that Claims 2, 4-8, 10, 12-16 and 18-23 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-23 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

*WLC. Zarbis*

William A. Zarbis  
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060

Date: 11/4/03